

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the remarks contained herein.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF IDS REFERENCE

It has come to our attention that the reference (Japanese No. 10-105695) on the IDS Form 1449, filed with the application on July 2, 2001, was not initialed by the Examiner indicating that the reference has been considered. We have enclosed a copy of the IDS Form 1449 for your convenience.

We would appreciate your initialing reference JP 10-105695 and returning a copy of the initialed IDS Form 1449 to our office at your earliest opportunity.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kirsten (U.S. Pat. No. 6,011,901). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsten (U.S. Pat. No. 6,011,901) in view of Just (U.S. Pat. No. 6,389,339). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

One of the features of the claimed invention is "selecting a cutdown mode in accordance with a correspondence between the synthesized image and the camera images". Such a feature is not taught nor suggested in Kirsten.

In Fig. 4 of Kirsten, video selector 70 merely selects single or multiple video fields or frames to be processed, but does not select a cutdown mode. Moreover, image compressor 74 does not receive a cutdown mode from video selector 70.

Furthermore, "video selector is important in selecting compression rates" at page 3, line 6 of OA is the obscure sentence for us. The relationship between the video selector and compression rates is not disclosed at col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 12 in Kirsten.

Accordingly, in view of this important difference between applicants' invention and Kirsten, it is respectfully submitted that the claims currently distinguish over Kirsten. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is courteously solicited.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov 12, 2004

By: 

Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
GAS/kk